

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
6 AT TACOMA

7 TIM ALAN GASS, f/n/a TIM ALAN
8 WARNER,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 KELLY HENDRICKS, CATHI
12 HARRIS, PATRICIA WILLIAMS, and
13 LESLIE SZIEBERT,

14 Defendants.

NO. C11-5732 RJB/KLS

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION

15 Before the Court is Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration of the Court's Order (ECF
16 No. 13) denying Plaintiff's motion for the appointment of counsel. ECF No. 16. Having
17 carefully reviewed the motion, and balance of the record, the Court finds that the motion for
18 reconsideration should be denied.

19 **DISCUSSION**

20 Motions for reconsideration are disfavored and will ordinarily be denied in the
21 "absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal
22 authority which could not have been brought to the court's attention earlier with reasonable
23 diligence." Local Rule CR 7(h)(1).

24 Pursuant to CR 7(h)(2), a motion for reconsideration shall be filed within ten judicial
25 days following the order to which it relates. The Order denying Plaintiff's motion for the
26 appointment of counsel was entered on October 18, 2011. ECF No. 13. Plaintiff's motion for

1 reconsideration was filed on November 30, 2011. ECF No. 16. Therefore, his motion for
2 reconsideration is not timely and may be denied on that basis alone.

3 Plaintiff states that although he was involved in prior litigation, he merely signed what
4 was prepared by other residents. In addition, he claims that he is a special needs resident and
5 had to rely on the help of a friend to start this case. ECF No. 16. Relying on the assistance of
6 others because one lacks legal skills does not warrant the appointment of counsel. The
7 information before the Court indicates that Plaintiff has adequately articulated his claims.
8 Plaintiff has not provided this Court with any information that would indicate otherwise. This
9 Court previously told Plaintiff that if he needs additional time to prosecute this matter due to
10 mental or physical constraints, he should provide the Court with documentation of his medical
11 conditions so that the Court may make a determination as to any additional time and/or
12 assistance that may be required in this case.
13

14
15 Plaintiff has identified no error in the Court's Order and has presented no new facts or
16 legal authority. Therefore, reconsideration is inappropriate.

17 Accordingly, it is **ORDERED**:

18 (1) Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (ECF No. 16) is **DENIED**.

19 (2) The Clerk is directed to send copies of this Order to Plaintiff and counsel for
20 Defendants.
21

22 **DATED** this 6th day of December, 2011.

23
24 
25 Karen L. Strombom
26 United States Magistrate Judge